

## ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 325 **COMMISSIONERS** 

JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman 2006 NOV 21 P 2: 12 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL AZ CORP COMMISSION MIKE GLEASON DOCUMENT CONTROL KRISTIN K. MAYES

**BARRY WONG** 

1

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY FOR A HEARING TO DETERMINE THE FAIR VALUE OF THE UTILITY PROPERTY OF THE COMPANY FOR RATEMAKING PURPOSES, TO FIX A JUST AND REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN THEREON, TO APPROVE RATE

SCHEDULES DESIGNED TO DEVELOP SUCH RETURN, AND TO AMEND DECISION NO. 67744. 11

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY INTO THE

FREQUENCY OF UNPLANNED OUTAGES DURING 2005 AT PALO VERDE NUCLEAR

GENERATING STATION, THE CAUSES OF THE OUTAGES, THE PROCUREMENT OF

REPLACEMENT POWER AND THE IMPACT OF THE OUTAGES ON ARIZONA PUBLIC

SERVICE COMPANY'S CUSTOMERS.

IN THE MATTER OF THE AUDIT OF THE FUEL AND PURCHASED POWER PRACTICES AND

COSTS OF THE ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY.

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0816

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0826

DOCKET NO. E-01345A-05-0827

## STAFF'S NOTICE OF FILING

Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission hereby provides notice of filing the Direct Testimony Summary of Ralph C. Smith in the above-referenced matters.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 21 day of November, 2006.

23

24

25

26

17

18

19

20

21

22

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

NOV 2 1 2006

DOCKETED BY



Christophe C. Kempley, Chief Counsel Janet Wagner, Senior Staff Counsel

Charles Hains, Attorney Arizona Corporation Commission

1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

(602) 542-3402

28

1	Original and 17 copies of the foregoing filed this 2 day of November, 2006 with:	
2		
° 3	Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission	
	1200 West Washington	
4	Phoenix, AZ 85007	
5		
6	Copy of the foregoing mailed this	
7	21 day of November, 2006 to:	
_ ′	Deborah R. Scott	Michael W. Patten
8	Kimberly A. Grouse	J. Matthew Derstine
	SNELL & WILMER	Laura E. Sixkiller
9	One Arizona Center	ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
10	400 East Van Buren Street	One Arizona Center
- 0	Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202	400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
11		Phoenix, AZ 85004
12	Thomas L. Mumaw	
12	Karilee S. Ramaley	Michael L. Kurtz
13	PINNACLE WEST CAPITAL	BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY
1.4	CORPORATION Post Office Box 53999, MS 8695	36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OH 45202
14	Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999	Cilicinian, Ori 43202
15	1 Hooma, 102 03072-3999	Scott S. Wakefield
	C. Webb Crockett	RUCO
16	Patrick J. Black	1110 West Washington Street, Suite 220
17	FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.	Phoenix, AZ 85007
- 1	3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600	
18	Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913	Lawrence V. Robertson, Jr.
10		Post Office Box 1448
19	Michelle Livengood	Tubac, AZ 85646
20	UniSource Energy Services	D:11 No
	One South Church Street, Suite 200 Tucson, AZ 85702	Bill Murphy Murphy Consulting
21	1 desoil, 142 (3702	5401 North 25 <sup>th</sup> Street
22	Donna M. Bronski	Phoenix, AZ 85016
	Deputy City Attorney	
23	City Attorney's Office	Andrew W. Bettwy
24	3939 North Drinkwater Boulevard	Karen S. Haller
<b>4</b>	Scottsdale, AZ 85251	Assistants General Cunsel
25		Legal Affairs Department
2	George Bien-Willner	5241 Spring Mountain Road
26	3641 North 39 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Las Vegas, NV 89150
27	Phoenix, AZ 85014	

	Amanda Ormond	Dan Austin
1	The Ormond Group LLC	Comverge, Inc.
	Southwest Representative	6509 West Frye Road, Suite 4
2	Interwest Energy Alliance	Chandler, AZ 85226
3	7650 South McClintock, Suite 103-282	
3	Tempe, AZ 85284	Timothy M. Hogan
4	Tempe, AZ 83284	Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
- 7	Joseph Vyerram Drogidant	202 East McDowell Road, Suite 153
5	Joseph Knauer, President	
	Jewish Community of Sedona	Phoenix, AZ 85004
6	and the Verde Valley	Total Manager
	100 Meadowlark Drive	Jay I. Moyes
7	Post Office Box 10242	Moyes Storey Ltd.
	Sedona, AZ 86339-8242	1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 110
8	[본다] [문민기 [논민기] 발표가 되는데 이 상태	Phoenix, AZ 85004
9	David C. Kennedy, Esq.	
	818 East Osborn Road, Suite 103	Kenneth R. Saline, P.E.
10	Phoenix, AZ 85014	K.R. Saline & Assoc., PLC
		160 North Pasadena, Suite 101
11	S. David Childers, Esq.	Mesa, AZ 85201
	LOW & CHILDERS	
12	2999 North 44 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 250	Robert W. Geake
13	Phoenix, AZ 85018	Vice President and General Counsel
13		Arizona Water Company
14	Tracy Spoon	Post Office Box 29006
17	Sun City Taxpayers Association	Phoenix, AZ 85038-9006
15	12630 North 103 <sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 144	
	Sun City, AZ 85351	Lieutenant Colonel Karen S. White
16		Chief, Air Force Utility Litigation Team
	Tammie Woody	AFLSA/JACL-ULT
17	10825 West Laurie Lane	139 Barnes Drive
18	Peoria, AZ 85345	Tyndall AFB, FL 32403
10		
19	Douglas V. Fant	Greg Patterson
	Law Offices of Douglas V. Fant	Arizona Competitive Power Alliance
20	3655 West Anthem Drive, Suite A-109	916 West Adams Street, Suite 3
	Anthem, AZ 85086	Phoenix, AZ 85007
21	7 minerii, 7127 03000	TROUMA, AZ 63007
	Walter W. Meek, President	Jim Nelson
22	Arizona Utility Investors Association	12621 North 17 <sup>th</sup> Place
23	1	
23	2100 North Central Avenue, Suite 210	Phoenix, AZ 85022
24	Phoenix, AZ 85004	
~ T		Barbara Klemstine
25	Sein Seitz, President	Brian Brumfield
	Arizona Solar Energy Industries Association	Arizona Public Service
26	3008 North Civic Center Plaza	Post Office Box 53999, MS 9708
	Scottsdale, AZ 85251	Phoenix, AZ 85072-3999
27		

1	Jon Poston
2	AARP Electric Rate Project 6733 East Dale Lane
3	Cave Creek, AZ 85331
4	Coralette Hannon
5	AARP Government Relations & Advocacy 6705 Reedy Creek Road
6	Charlotte, NC 28215
7	
87	roseann Osorio
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	
26	

## DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RALPH C. SMITH EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My testimony addresses the following issues:

• The Company's proposed depreciation rates.

My findings and recommendations for each of these areas are as follows:

- The depreciation rates proposed by APS presented in Mr. White's Attachments REW-1 and REW-2 should be adopted for use in this case. The depreciation rates proposed by APS were developed in a manner that is consistent with the Commission's rules for depreciation rates. My review of the details provided in Mr. White's Attachments REW-1 and REW-2 and other information indicates that those new rates proposed by APS are consistent with a "technical update" approach to the depreciation rates that the Commission approved in Decision 67744. The net change in percentage terms resulting from APS's technical update in composite terms is fairly small, an increase of 0.06 percentage points for APS plant and a decrease of 0.20 percentage points for plant that APS acquired from PWEC.
- Each of the new depreciation rates proposed by APS should be clearly broken out between (1) a service life rate and (2) a net salvage rate, similar to the rates shown in Appendix A to the Commission's Decision No. 67744. By doing this, the depreciation expense related to the inclusion of estimated future cost of removal in depreciation rates can be tracked and accounted for by plant account.
- APS's depreciation rates include estimated future cost of removal. In contrast with APS's approach, a normalized expense allowance approach better conforms with the generally accepted accounting principles articulated in SFAS 143 by not treating estimated inflated future removal costs as if they were a current obligation and a current expense. Additional advantages offered by the normalized expense allowance approach include that it is simple, straight-forward and easy to implement, provides an opportunity for the Company to recover a normalized allowance for cost of removal based on recent actual cost, and avoids charging current customers for estimated future inflation. However, the Commission's rules at R14-2-102 in their present state would appear to preclude this alternative for purposes of this case. Rule R14-2-102 is a rule of general applicability to electric utilities in the state of Arizona. Because I believe there is no compelling reason to treat cost of removal (where there is no current obligation to incur such cost) differently from other normalized operating expenses, I recommend that the Commission consider amending Rule R14-2-102 to allow treatment of cost of removal in the manner recommended by Staff's consultant in the prior APS rate case.